DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 117 VT 011 192

AUTHOR	Roberts, Chester F., Jr.
TITLE	Rehabilitative Influences in California Youth Conservation Camps. Phase I: The California Youth Conservation Camps and Their Wards.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of the Youth Authority, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	RR-43
PUB DATE	May 65
NOTE	59p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.05
DESCRIPTORS	*Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Delinquents, Individual Characteristics, *Institutional Environment, *Manpower Development, *Rehabilitation Programs, Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	*California Youth Conservation Camps

ABSTRACT

To provide a general overview of the Youth Conservation Camp environment and the differences and similarities among camps due to selective assignment and the "weeding-out" process, a review was made of four main camps operated by the California Youth Authority and the California Division of Forestry. An analysis of the major personal and background characteristics of the camp wards during 1962 and 1963 disclosed that: (1) The wards 16 years old and above who are assigned to camps are significantly different from Youth Authority wards in other institutions in terms of parole performance characteristics, (2) No one camp displays a significant difference in overall parole performance in relation to the total camps, (3) Data from 1962 parolees suggest that there are differences in the parole performance of certain categories of wards when released from different camps, and (4) Wards assigned to each of the four camps show a number of significant characteristic differences in comparison with the proportion in the total camps. Phase 2 of the study is VT 008 900. (SB)

ED041117

research report number 43 may 1965

rehabilitative influences in California youth conservation camps,

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VT011192

phase 1: THE CALIFORNIA YOUTH CONSERVATION CAMPS AND THEIR WARDS,

BY CHESTER F. ROBERTS, Jr.

State of California
DEPARTMENT of the YOUTH AUTHORITY

state of
california

EDMUND G. BROWN
governor

youth and adult corrections agency

RICHARD A. McGEE
administrator

department of the youth authority

HEMAN G. STARK
director

William L. Tregoning
deputy director

KEITH S. GRIFFITHS
chief of research

JOACHIM P. SECKEL
associate social research analyst

CHESTER F. ROBERTS, Jr.
assistant social research analyst

ED041117

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NO.
SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretic Framework, Operational Hypotheses, Definitions and Study Design	3
Organization of the Study	6
THE CALIFORNIA YOUTH CONSERVATION CAMPS	7
Purposes of the Camps	8
Camp Setting	9
Camp Routine	11
THE PERSONAL AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF CAMP WARDS	12
Comparisons of Camp Wards with Other Youth Authority Wards	14
Age	16
Court of Commitment	17
Ethnic Background	18
Region of Commitment	19
Admission Status	20
Type of Offense	20
Summary Profile	21
The Distribution of Ward Characteristics Among Camps	22
Ben Lomond	23
Mt. Bullion	23
Pine Grove	25
Washington Ridge	25
The Institutional Origins of Camps Wards	25
THE WEEDING-OUT PROCESS: TRANSFERS AND ESCAPES	27
THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CAMPS PAROLEES	30
Base Expectancy Categories for Camp Parolees	30
PAROLE PERFORMANCE OF THE 1962 PAROLE COHORT	32
Parole Performance and Characteristics Interactions by Specific Camps	37
20-years-of-age and over vs. all other age groups	37
Negroes vs. all other racial groupings	38
Bay Area/Other commitments vs. all other commitments	38
CONCLUSIONS	41
APPENDIX A: The Concept of the "Self" and Its Relationship to Treatment	43
APPENDIX B: Explanation of the Type of Offense Categories	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.		PAGE NO.
1	Frequencies of Parole Violation and Proportions of Violators Among Total Male Release Cohorts and Youth Conservation Camp Parolees, 1956-1961.....	2
2	Name, Capacity and Date of Activation of California Youth Conservation Camps.....	8
3	Comparison of Wards 16-Years-of-Age and Over, in Camps and Other Institutions, by Parole Risk Categories, for 1961 and 1962 Release Cohorts.....	13
4	Characteristics of Youth Authority Wards in Institutions, for the Population Sixteen-Years-of-Age and Over, and for the Camps Population, by Percentages at Six-Month Intervals June 30, 1962 - December 31, 1963.....	15
5	Median Ages of Total Youth Authority Populations, Youth Authority Populations 16-Years-of-Age-and Over, and Camps Populations, at Six Month Intervals, June 30, 1962 - December 31, 1963.....	16
6	Juvenile and Criminal Court Commitments to the Youth Authority, Department of Corrections Institutions and Youth Authority Camps at Six-Month Intervals, June 30, 1962 - December 31, 1963.....	18
7	Characteristics of Wards Released from Youth Authority Camps, During 1962 and 1963 As Percentage of Total Camp Population.....	24
8	Institutional Origin of Youth Authority Release Cohorts Prior to Their Admission to Camp, 1962-63.....	26
9	Youth Conservation Camp Release Cohorts, by Type of Release	27
10	Comparison of Characteristics of Parole Releasees and of Non-Parole Releasees from Youth Conservation Camps, 1962 and 1963 Cohorts, by Percentage of Type of Release.....	29
11	Characteristics of Wards Released to Parole from Youth Authority Conservation Camps, by Percent of Camps Release Cohorts for 1962 and 1963.....	31
12	Percentages of Parole Releasees in Three Base Expectancy Categories, by Camp for 1962 and 1963.....	32
13	Parole Performance of 1962 Camp Parole Releasees, by Percentage of Violators and Non-Violators of Parole following 15 Month from Date of Release.....	33

(Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

TABLE NO.		PAGE NO.
14	Parole Performance of 1962 Camp Parole Releasees, by Percentage of "Good" Time on Parole.....	34
15	Ward Characteristics and Parole Performance for 1962 Camp Parolees, by Camp.....	36
16	Parole Violation Rates of Wards Dichotomized by Age, for Each Camp vs. Other Camps, 1962 Parole Cohort.....	37
17	Parole Violation Rates of Wards by Racial Grouping for Each Camp vs. Other Camps, 1962 Parole Cohort.....	38
18	Parole Violation Rates of Wards by Region of Commitment, for Each Camp vs. Other Camps, 1962 Parole Cohort.....	39

SUMMARY

1. The purpose of the general study (of which the present report represents the first phase) is to examine identifiable and relevant factors in the camp programs which are related to the parole performance of wards exposed to those programs. The present report is intended to: (a) provide a general over-view of the Youth Conservation Camp programs and their operations; (b) define the uniqueness of the camps populations, in terms of available personal and background characteristics of wards, in relation to the general California Youth Authority ward population; and (c) assess the degree of intercamp variability in terms of ward characteristics and define some relevant inter-camp and intra-camp subdivisions of the ward populations.

2. The theoretic framework of the study sees positive rehabilitative change as a consequence of the interaction between elements of the "camp milieu" and complementary factors in the socio-psychological make-up ("self") of the ward. "Camp milieu" is defined as "the totality of common factors which may affect the life and experience of wards while in camp and which might influence the nature of their post-release reactions to parole."

3. A series of methodological assumptions propose 1) identification and definition of relevant factors in the camp milieux and in the backgrounds and personalities of the wards, 2) comparison of the effects of different camp milieu factors upon the parole performance of similar types of wards, 3) study of effects of particular camp milieu factors upon different types of wards, and 4) assessment of the forms of interaction between various camp milieu factors and socio-psychological

"self" factors related to wards which appear to affect post-release parole performance.

4. A series of five reports, each covering a different phase of the study, is projected.

5. The major findings of the present report on Phase I of the study include the following:

   a. The camps population is consistently and significantly differentiated in comparison to the male Youth Authority population 16-years-of-age and over in terms of Age, Ethnic Background, Region of Commitment, and Type of Offense. The camps population is characterized in relation to the Youth Authority population by (i) a higher concentration of wards in the 18-19-year age bracket, (ii) greater porportions of non-Caucasians, (iii) larger proportional commitments from Central Valley counties, and (iv) larger proportions of wards committed for Type III offenses (burglary, auto theft and other thefts.)

   b. Each of the individual camp populations varied consistently and significantly from the total camps population in one or more of the sets of characteristics examined. Ben Lomond contained an over-proportion of wards from Bay Area counties. Mt. Bullion contained over-proportions of younger wards, wards from Southern California counties, and Juvenile court commitments. Pine Grove varied the least, containing only a small over-proportion of wards from Central Valley counties. Washington Ridge contained an over-proportion of Criminal court commitments.

   c. An analysis of the pre-camp institutional origins of camp wards suggests that inter-camp differences in characteristics are

possibly a function of the relationship which seems to persist between certain camps and certain originating institutions. That is, different camps consistently receive the major proportions of their wards from distinct originating institutions. Thus, Ben Lomond receives wards predominantly from NRCC and the CDC-RGC; Mount Bullion receives nearly all wards sent to camps by SRCC; Pine Grove receives wards primarily from CDC-RGC and YA Institutions; while Washington Ridge receives mainly from CDC-RGC and NRCC.

d. An analysis of the "weeding-out" process (the elimination of certain wards from the camp populations due to disciplinary transfers, escapes, etc.) indicates wide variations in both transfer and escape rates from different camps. However, there were no consistently significant differences between non-parole and parole releasees on any of the seven personal and background characteristics examined. (Age, Court of Commitment, Ethnic Background, Region of Commitment, Admission Status and Offense Category) Thus, the "weeding-out" of this segment would not appear to have significantly affected the proportional composition of the camp populations in terms of these characteristics.

e. When camp parolees were compared in terms of base expectancy risk-levels, no significant differences were found between the proportions for any particular camp and the overall camp proportions.

f. The parole performance of 1962 parolees from camps, during the fifteen months following their release, reveals no significant

difference in the proportions of parole violators for any particular camp in relation to the overall camp proportions, or between any pairs of camps.

Parole violation rates for specific categories of wards from the 1962 cohort (defined by some common background characteristics, such as a particular age grouping, racial grouping, or offense category) were compared with the parole violation rates of other cohort wards, over all four camps. Significant statistical relationships were found in relation to three such categories: 20-years-of-age-and-over, Negro, and Bay Area/Other commitments.

When the parole violation rates for wards in these three categories were compared with the rates for other wards at each camp individually vs. all other camps combined, significant relationships were found for the 20-years-of-age-and-over category at Mt. Bullion and at Ben Lomond, for the Negro category at Pine Grove, and for the Bay Area/Other category at Pine Grove.

6. The data examined tentatively suggest that certain types of wards, defined by some common characteristics, appear more amenable to rehabilitative influences within some camp milieux than within others.

INTRODUCTION

Previous publications of the Division of Research have indicated that there are considerable differences in the parole violation rates of California Youth Authority wards paroled from different facilities. Youth Conservation Camps operated by the CYA in conjunction with the California State Division of Forestry have consistently shown lower violation rates than have most other types of facilities. (1; 2; 3; 4)[1]

The parole violation rates for the camps are compared with the violation rates for all institutions for each yearly release cohort, 1956 - 1961, in Table 1 (next page).

Three hypotheses have been advanced in explanation of the better performance of camp parolees:

1. The better performance of camp parolees is primarily due to selective procedures which tend to eliminate poor parole-risk wards from the camps eligibility lists, or to "weed-out" such poor risks during their camp stay in the form of disciplinary transfers, escapes, etc.

2. The better performance of camp parolees is primarily due to a superior type of rehabilitative experience provided by camps in comparison with other institutions.

3. The better performance of camp parolees is primarily due to the interaction of differential camp experience upon types of wards who are more amenable to the therapeutic influence of the particular experiences to which they are exposed at the camps.

In order to further explore the validity of these hypotheses, two research projects have been initiated by the Division of Research. One project will examine the effects of selectivity factors and differential treatment upon parole performance in relation to experimental and control

---

[1] References refer to numbered works in the Bibliography.

Table 1

Frequencies of Parole Violation and Proportions of Violators Among Total Male Release Cohorts and Youth Conservation Camp Parolees, 1956-1961

Year	Institution	No. Released	No. Violated	Proportion Violated	Difference between Proportion
1956[b]	All Instit.	2568	1389	.541	.172***[a]
	Camps	268	99	.369	
1957[b]	All Instit.	2841	1444	.508	.122***
	Camps	337	130	.386	
1958[b]	All Instit.	3314	1560	.471	.159***
	Camps	311	97	.312	
1959	All Instit.	4704	2174	.462	.127***
	Camps	463	155	.335	
1960	All Instit.	5132	2430	.473	.110***
	Camps	554	201	.363	
1961[c]	All Instit.	3046	1328	.436	.138***
	Camps	285	85	.298	

Source: (2, Appendix A, for 1956-60 data)

[a]Significance levels were determined by Chi-square techniques comparing the proportions of violators and of non-violators among the camps to "expected" proportions based upon the All Institutions proportions. (*** = less than .001)

[b]Includes only Juvenile court commitments.

[c]Includes only First Commitment wards.

groups from among "camp eligible" wards randomly assigned to camps and to other institutions. The results of this project will be reported elsewhere. The present study stems directly from the third hypothesis and, assuming it to be the most likely explanation, examines the nature of the interaction between different types of wards exposed to different camp milieu in terms of in-camp adjustment and post-parole behavior.

Theoretic Framework, Operational Hypotheses, Definitions and Study Design

The term "camp milieu" is taken to include the totality of factors which may affect the life and experience of wards while in camp and which might influence the nature of their post-release reactions to parole. A "camp milieu" may include such factors as the nature of the ward's peer associations while in camp, the ward's status in the informal peer-group social structure, the nature of the work program to which he is exposed, the intensity of regimentation and control to which he must adapt, the orientation and treatment philosophies of staff personnel at the camp, the availability of recreational and avocational resources, and even the simple facts of physical surroundings which attach to the camp. A more comprehensive listing of such factors is unnecessary for the purposes of this study.

The study assumes, with most other works in the field, that the end goal of delinquency treatment, of whatever form, is positive change in the character, overt behavior, attitudes, predispositions and/or emotional outlook of the person undergoing treatment, in line with current interpretations of acceptable social standards. The extent to which a particular

"treatment" can affect such a change is seen as highly dependent upon the nature of the material to be transformed, i.e., the "self"[2] which the ward brings to the treatment process. Thus, change is seen as an overall consequence of the interaction of elements in the treatment process with factors in the socio-psychological make-up of the ward.

It is within the framework of this complex pattern of interaction between the individual "self" and the treatment process that clues to the affective elements contained within the process must be found and defined if the effectiveness of the process is to be evaluated and enhanced. The present study attempts to define such treatment elements within the camp milieux which appear to affect either positive, or negative, change in wards, and to define the "types" of wards whose "self's" appear to be most amenable to change under exposure to various combinations of such treatment elements.

The basic orientation of the study will require the identification and definition of 1) those characteristics of wards, most relevant to their camp adjustment and subsequent parole behavior, upon which a discriminative typology of wards may be based, and 2) relevant factors within the camp milieux which serve to distinguish one camp from another. Then the degree of differential assignment of wards to different camps can be determined in terms of those characteristics which tend to distinguish one camp population from another. Knowing how each camp population differs from another, in terms of the variables used, and the extent of the differences,

---

[2]See Appendix A for a theoretical discussion of the "self" concept and its relationship to delinquency treatment.

then intercamp comparisons can be made upon the effects of different camp milieu factors in relation to similar types of wards, intra-camp comparisons can be made upon the effects of similar camp milieu factors upon different types of wards, and, finally, the role of various interaction processes between camp milieux and ward characteristic factors, which induce, or deter, desired changes in wards, can be adduced through before-and-after analyses in depth of various types of wards exposed to various kinds of camp milieu factors.

To pretend however, that a limited study could even begin to examine all elements involved in the camp milieu and in the personal background and socio-psychological set of the wards, much less the complex of interactions between them, would be extreme sophistry. Therefore, the actual variables and interactions to be studied must necessarily be limited in scope to: 1) those which are most readily available and amenable to examination and measurement, and 2) those which, for various reasons, are believed to be the most relevant.

The first of the above limitations restricts the basic data to such variables as are observable in the setting of different camps and in the behavior of staff and wards, to information contained in CYA record files and camp records, and to extractions from questionnaires and interviews with both staff and wards.

The second limitation must be guided by the recorded research of others in the analysis of institutional behavior and effects, and upon the accumulated experience and insight of professional workers in the field of delinquency treatment and corrections.

Methodological considerations concerned with various phases of the study will have to be predicated upon the types of data to be analyzed and the specific hypotheses under investigation. Additional theoretical and methodological comment will be found throughout the reports on various phases of the study, wherever they are relevant.

Organization of the Study

The entire study is divided into five phases, for each of which a separate report will be issued. It is hoped that each report will be, as far as possible, self-contained and distinct, in that each will form a complete study of a different aspect of the overall research outline.

Phase I, the present report, will serve as a general over-view of the camp environment and of the differences and similarities among camps due to selective assignment and the "weeding-out" process.

Phase II will examine the background, philosophy and orientation of the administrations and staffs of two selected study camps in an attempt to define similarities and differences which might be related to differential change and adjustment among wards.

Phase III will focus upon the informal peer group structures at the two study camps, the relationship of peer group structure and status to attitudinal motifs and personal characteristics of the wards, staff evaluations of wards, and ward reactions to the camp experience.

Phase IV will focus upon a selected sample of wards from each of the two study camps in an effort to explore in depth the socio-psychological background of the wards and the processes of ward interaction with the camp milieu factors defined in preceding reports.

Phase V, the final report, will attempt to relate the relevant factors outlined in previous phases with the actual adjustment of the ward to community life following release, will evaluate the significance of these factors in relation to actual parole performance data, and will attempt to assess the affective role which various factors in the camp milieu have played in inducing a positive rehabilitative experience among wards.

THE CALIFORNIA YOUTH CONSERVATION CAMPS

The Youth Conservation Camps operated jointly by the California Youth Authority and the State Division of Forestry are an outgrowth of the juvenile work camp concept originated and developed in Los Angeles county more than 35 years ago. (9, p. 3ff) A recent definition of this concept describes the camps as "minimum security, open-type residential facilities of limited population, built around a constructive program for selected young male offenders." (10 p. 819)

In 1943 the Youth Authority Act of the State of California (originally passed in 1941) was amended to permit the Authority to establish and operate camps similar to those already in operation in a number of California counties. The first camp was established at Whitmore, near Redding, but is no longer operative. The second camp was activated at Coarsegold, in Madera county, and is still operative as a subsidiary (Spike) camp to Mt. Bullion camp. Main camps and Spike camps presently operated by the Youth Authority, their capacities and dates of activation, are shown in Table 2. (next page) Thirty-one similar camps are operated conjointly by the Department of Corrections and the Division of Forestry for use with adult offenders.

Purposes of the Camps

The Division of Forestry sees a dual purpose in the camp program. That is

> ...Forestry is provided with manpower to perform the labor involved in a variety of public conservation projects. Selected... wards... are provided the benefits to be derived from healthful living and the development of new habits associated with dignified employment in outdoor work. (5, Appendix)

Table 2

Name, Capacity and Date of Activation of California Youth Conservation Camps

Camp	Capacity	Date of Activation
Ben Lomond	70	May 1, 1947
Mt. Bullion	65	August 22, 1956
Coarsegold[a]	20	September 1, 1945
Blasingame	20	November 1, 1950
Pine Grove	70	September 25, 1945
Washington Ridge	80	September 11, 1961
Smartsville	20	March 14, 1952

Source: (5 p. 1)

[a]Spike camps are shown indented under the main camp with which they are affiliated.

Although Youth Authority personnel generally emphasize other aspects of the camp experience as major factors in the treatment program, such as the less restrictive atmosphere within which the ward can seek solutions to his own problems and learn socially acceptable modes of behavior in

interaction with others, there is little doubt that the work program is an important element in the camp milieu. The primary work emphasis is upon fire prevention and fire fighting. Reforestation, insect and plant disease control, forestry trail and road maintenance, and the development of public camp grounds and recreational areas, are among the other important conservation projects undertaken by the camp work crews.

Camp Setting

A major aspect of any camp milieu is the simply physical setting and condition of the camp-site. The age and condition of repair of buildings and facilities, the dreariness or attractiveness of the natural environment, the degree of isolation from other human habitation, all contribute in an unmeasurable manner to the ability of human beings to adapt to their surroundings. Wide differences exist between the various camps in these factors.

Ben Lomond is located on a hill-top in the Santa Cruz mountains overlooking the Pacific ocean. It is the only youth camp situated near the coast. A number of summer homes and resort areas are in the immediate vicinity, two small villages are close by and the city of Santa Cruz is about 10 miles distant. The camp buildings are of wooden construction with a rustic appearance. The major work emphasis of wards at the camp involves the maintenance of public parks and picnic grounds.

Mt. Bullion camp lies at the head of an attractive small valley in the Sierra foothills overlooking the Merced river in Mariposa county. The location is relatively isolated with few villages or towns in the vicinity, although a major highway leading to Yosemite national park runs nearby.

Pine Grove camp is situated in an area of jack-pine forest just east of the town of Jackson in Amador county. A number of ranches and private homes are nearby. The area is dry and unprepossessing in appearance, although work crews often go into the more densely forested upper regions of the Sierras during the days. It is the oldest camp still operated by the Youth Authority and most of the original buildings are still in use. The buildings are primarily wooden, of peeled log and slab construction. The general appearance of the camp, through no fault of the administration, is rather dull and dreary.

Washington Ridge camp rests on a spur of the main Sierra, several miles east of Nevada City in Nevada County. The camp is relatively isolated with only a few large ranches in the vicinity. Built in 1960, the buildings are all new, of brick and concrete construction. The camp area was developed in accordance with the latest functional planning for facilities of its type. It presents a modern, functional, if slightly cold and formal, appearance.

At all four of the main camps, the wards live in a single dormitory building with toilet facilities. This building may also include a library and television or radio listening room, and perhaps a game-room or lounge. Kitchen and dining facilities are located in a separate building. Attached to the dining-rooms at Washington Ridge and Mt. Bullion is a large recreation room, used partly as a gymnasium. At other camps this is in a separate building. Administration offices for both the Youth Authority and the Division of Forestry are maintained in a separate building.

Camp Routine

The day-to-day routine for all camps is generally similar. Each camp has a dual administration: a Youth Authority staff and a Forestry staff. The Forestry staff assigns and oversees the forestry conservation tasks to be performed; the Youth Authority staff determines crew assignments of wards and is responsible for their welfare and security. To a considerable extent the work of the two staffs overlap. Thus, Forestry foremen often function as counselors to the wards, and Youth Authority staff often direct forestry activities in the woods and on fire-lines.

Each camp generally maintains three work crews of between 15 and 20 wards each, in addition to a small number of special detail crews: cook's helpers, clerks, camp maintenance workers, etc. Each of the large crews usually works under the direction of a Youth Authority group supervisor and a Forestry work foreman, although smaller crews may be sent out under the supervision of only the Forestry work foreman. The crews work an eight-hour day, five days per week. The wards receive 50 cents per day for their work, which is applied to their account and may be drawn on for cigarettes, candy and other personal needs. In the evenings and during week-ends, supervised recreation and entertainment are provided, the nature of which varies between camps. Individual and group counselling sessions may also be scheduled during off-work hours.

Staff reports on the work and behavior of each ward are made out periodically by both Youth Authority and Forestry personnel. These reports serve as the basis for staff reviews of ward adjustment and for their recommendations to the Youth Authority Board when a ward becomes eligible for consideration for parole.

THE PERSONAL AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF CAMP WARDS

During his stay at camp a ward may react to the camp setting; and to an even greater extent his interaction with significant staff members in various situations may affect his adjustment to camp and to post-release life. But the major relationship in his camp experience, especially in terms of frequency of contact, is most likely to be with the other wards at the camp. Thus intake selectivity affects not only the type of ward who attends a particular camp, but also dictates the types of wards with whom he will interact within the camp environment.

Wards eligible for the camps are generally selected according to several criteria which distinguish them from other Youth Authority ward populations. For instance, wards convicted of assaultive offenses, wards with known narcotic addiction records, and sexual deviates are usually not eligible. Camp wards must be physically able to work in the woods at rather arduous tasks, thus limiting eligibility to the older (wards under 16 are seldom eligible) and the more physically able. Accident-prone, escape-prone and known malingerers are usually eliminated from the eligibles lists. In practice, the Youth Authority Board determines, on the basis of background and prior record, which wards shall be assigned to camp. Wards are not compelled to go to camp, however, and may request assignment elsewhere.

As a result of this selectivity through the application of eligibility criteria, the wards assigned to camps consistently show a much better parole-risk potential (as determined by base expectancy equations) than do wards assigned to other facilities. This difference is indicated in

Table 3, where camp parolees are compared with similar-aged parolees from other institutions on the basis of risk expectancy categories as determined by base expectancy scores:

Table 3

Comparison of Wards 16-Years-of-Age and Over, in Camps and Other Institutions, by Parole Risk Categories, for 1961 and 1962 Release Cohorts[3]

Year	Facilities	Parole Risk Categories								Probability of Chance Difference of Overall Proportion (χ^2)
		Total Wards		Good Risks		Aver. Risks		Poor Risks		
		No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
1961	Camps	495	100.0	295	59.6	124	25.1	76	15.3	$p < .001$
	Other	4634	100.0	1757	37.9	1621	35.0	1256	27.1	
1962	Camps	640	100.0	310	48.4	212	33.1	118	18.4	$p < .001$
	Other	4639	100.0	1845	39.8	1763	38.0	1031	22.2	

Source: (3 p. 5)

[3]Hereafter, all references to Base Expectancy Scores will refer to the 1962 four-variable base expectancy equation. The six risk categories utilized in the referenced work have been collapsed to three for the purposes of this study.

If peer group association is an affective element in the camp milieu, then different kinds of post-release performance might be expected between similar wards exposed to different peer-group environments, i.e., camps containing widely divergent types of wards in terms of personal and background characteristics.

The nature of such peer-group associations will be examined in the report on Phase III of this study. At the moment the focus will be upon

distributional similarities and differences among wards sent to the various camps, in terms of their known characteristics. The record card for each ward of the Youth Authority contains data upon seven such characteristics: sex, age, court of commitment, race, county of commitment, admission status (first admission or readmission), and most recent offense. Each of these sets of characteristics will be examined in order, in comparisons of 1) the camp populations to the general Youth Authority population, and 2) in determining differences and similarities among the several camp populations.

The data presented in comparisons of the camp populations with the general Youth Authority populations are derived from the semi-annual census of all wards under Youth Authority supervision on June 30 and December 31 of 1962 and 1963. The inter-camp comparisons are based upon annual release cohorts for 1962 and 1963, i.e., all wards released from camps during the respective years.

Comparisons of Camp Wards with Other Youth Authority Wards

Table 4 compares the proportional characteristics of camp wards with Youth Authority wards 16-years-of-age and over upon six of the seven characteristics variables shown upon ward record cards. Since admission to camps is restricted to males only, the sex characteristic is constant for the entire camps population.[4]

[4]For this reason all "Youth Authority" population figures and other data used hereafter will refer only to male wards. All such data also will refer only to wards in institutions on the indicated census date, and will not include wards on parole at that date.

Table 4

Characteristics of Youth Authority Wards in Institutions, for the Population Sixteen-Years-of-Age and Over, and for the Camps Population, by Percentages at Six-Month Intervals June 30, 1962 - December 31, 1963

Characteristics	June 30, 1962		Dec. 31, 1962		June 30, 1963		Dec. 31, 1963	
	Total CYA	Camps	Total CYA	Camps	Total CYA	Camps	Total CYA	Camps
Totals (N)	(4223) 100.0	(351) 100.0	(4272) 100.0	(305) 100.0	(4567) 100.0	(379) 100.0	(4611) 100.0	(349) 100.0
Age		***[a]		***		***		**
17 and under	36.9	25.1	37.2	29.8	39.3	36.4	40.4	32.9
18	20.5	29.9	19.5	30.5	18.7	24.0	18.0	23.2
19	20.1	21.9	19.4	21.6	18.3	19.8	18.3	20.3
20	14.3	11.7	14.8	10.8	15.3	16.9	14.4	17.5
21 and over	8.2	3.4	9.1	7.2	8.4	2.9	8.9	6.0
Court								**
Juvenile	53.7	57.0	54.3	51.1	56.4	54.1	57.9	51.0
Criminal	46.3	43.0	45.7	48.9	43.6	45.9	42.1	49.0
Ethnic Background		***		**		*		
Caucasian	55.8	43.9	55.0	45.3	55.5	48.5	53.3	48.1
Negro	22.4	28.5	23.3	28.5	23.7	27.2	25.1	28.4
Mex.-Amer./Other	21.8	27.6	21.7	26.2	20.8	24.3	21.6	23.5
Region of Commitment		***		***		***		***
Southern Calif.	63.4	59.5	64.4	50.2	64.5	49.9	65.3	56.4
Central Valley	13.1	19.7	13.2	21.6	12.7	21.9	12.1	18.6
Bay Area/Other	23.5	20.8	22.4	28.2	22.8	28.2	22.6	25.0
Admission Status						***		
First Admission	62.1	63.2	58.7	63.0	54.9	66.5	55.1	59.0
Readmission	37.9	36.8	41.3	37.0	45.1	33.5	44.9	41.0
Type of Offense[b]		***		***		***		***
Category III	50.1	65.5	49.1	68.5	48.9	71.2	47.7	66.8
Catgy. VII - VIII	16.4	14.0	18.1	13.4	18.1	11.6	20.7	18.6
Other	33.5	20.5	32.8	18.1	33.0	17.2	31.6	14.6

[a]Asterisks indicate significance of overall proportional differences based on chi-square for each characteristic between total populations and camps populations:* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

[b]See Appendix B.

Age. It has been noted that age is a major selection factor for camp eligibility--boys under sixteen are rarely eligible. Table 5 shows median ages for the general Youth Authority population, the Youth Authority population 16-years-of-age and over, and the camps population.[5]

Table 5

Median Ages of Total Youth Authority Populations, Youth Authority Populations 16-Years-of-Age and Over, and Camps Populations, at Six Month Intervals, June 30, 1962 - December 31, 1963

Date	Median Age: Total YA Population	YA Population 16 and Over	Camps Population
6/30/62	18.0	18.6	18.6
12/31/62	18.1	18.7	18.7
6/30/63	17.9	18.6	18.6
12/31/63	17.8	18.5	18.7

Source (8)

At each sample date, less than 40 percent of the camps population was younger than the median age for the total Youth Authority population upon that same date, but the differences between the medians for the camps populations and the YA populations 16-years-of-age and over were negligible.[6]

The comparison of medians, however, fails to reveal a fundamental difference between the camps populations and the "16-and-over" popula-

[5]Throughout this report, references to a camp population are to be understood as including those wards in any affiliated Spike camp, unless otherwise specified.

[6]Therefore all subsequent references to "Youth Authority" populations will refer only to this 16-years-of-age and over population, unless otherwise specified.

tions which appears in Table 4, where comparisons of the two populations by proportional age groups show significant differences for each sample date. Thus, the camps populations show considerably smaller proportions of wards under the age of 18 and over the age of 19 than would be expected from the age distribution for the "16-and-over" population generally. In terms of age, then, the camps populations are more highly homogeneous, centering upon the 18 and 19 year age level.

Court of Commitment. In the Youth Authority, wards committed by the Juvenile courts tend to be assigned to different institutions than those committed by the Criminal courts. This is largely due to age factors and to differential treatment needs. Only 6.5 percent of the Juvenile court commitments to the Youth Authority were over 17-years-of-age, while only 2.5 percent of Criminal court commitments were less than 18 years of age among the 1962 Youth Authority first commitments. (6, p. 15) The percentages for 1963 first commitments were 4.5 and 1.8 respectively. (7, p. 13) Younger wards are generally sent to institutions providing general educational courses, older wards tend to be sent to vocational training schools and adult correctional institutions.

Youth Authority wards assigned to institutions operated by the California Department of Corrections are predominantly Criminal court commitments, while, excluding the Youth Training School and the camps, less than 5 percent of the wards in Youth Authority-operated facilities are Criminal court commitments. Table 4 shows that there is little consistent difference in the proportions of Juvenile and Criminal court commitments between the general Youth Authority populations and the camps popula-

tions at any sample date. In Table 6, however, a considerable difference is seen between the proportions of Juvenile court and Criminal court commitments assigned to Department of Corrections institutions, Youth Authority institutions generally, and to camps.

Table 6

Juvenile and Criminal Court Commitments to the Youth Authority, Department of Corrections Institutions and Youth Authority Camps At Six-Month Intervals, June 30, 1962 - December 31, 1963

Dates	Dept. of Corrections Inst.				Youth Authority Inst.				Camps			
	Juvenile		Criminal		Juvenile		Criminal		Juvenile		Criminal	
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent
6/30/62	206	16.5	1041	83.5	2722	81.7	609	18.3	200	57.0	151	43.0
12/31/62	189	15.5	1033	84.5	2684	80.4	653	19.6	156	51.1	149	48.9
6/30/63	231	18.2	1041	81.8	2997	81.6	674	18.4	205	54.1	174	45.9
12/31/63	255	20.0	1018	80.0	3015	82.9	623	17.1	178	51.0	171	49.0

The camps are the only facilities housing Youth Authority wards which maintain a nearly equal balance of Juvenile and Criminal court commitments (the ratio at YTS is approximately 65:35.) Thus the camps population may be considered distinct and unique in relation to the populations at other types of institutions which house Youth Authority wards, in terms of proportions of wards committed from different courts, even though little difference is apparent when gross comparisons are made.

Ethnic Background. There are consistent, though decreasing, significant differences in racial composition between the Youth Authority

populations and the camps populations at each of the first three report dates shown in Table 4.

It is apparent that the total camps population at all dates is predominantly Caucasian, yet at each of the four dates there is smaller proportions of Caucasians among the camps population than would be expected from their proportions in the Youth Authority population. Conversely, larger proportions of both Negro and Mexican-American/Other wards are found at camp than would be expected. There is, however, some indication of a tendency to redress the observed imbalances in later dates. Thus, the percentage of Caucasians in the camps populations tended to rise between each of the first three dates, while the percentage of Mexican-American/Other wards tended to decrease between each of the last three dates. The proportions of Negroes in the camps population at each date remained fairly constant, despite small proportional increases in Negroes among the Youth Authority population generally.

Region of Commitment. There are consistent significant differences in Region of Commitment for wards in the camps populations in relation to the Youth Authority populations shown in Table 4. At all four report dates, wards from Southern California predominate among both populations, but among the camps populations Southern California wards are in smaller proportions than would be expected. Conversely, wards from Central Valley counties, a minority group in both populations, are found in greater than expected numbers among the camps populations though not shown in Table 4, the differences in proportions for Central Valley commitments, when compared to all other regions combined, was significant at the .001

level for each of the four dates; for the Southern California commitments vs. other regions combined, the difference was significant at the .01 level only for the two middle dates. There was no significant difference between the proportions for Bay Area/Other commitments at any one of the dates.

Admission Status. For the purposes of this analysis, "First Admission" to Youth Authority custody is distinguished from all other admission status categories, which are grouped as "Readmission". At only one of the four report dates in Table 4 is there a significant difference between the proportions of First Admission wards and Readmission wards in the camps populations and in the Youth Authority populations. In both populations the majority of wards are First Admissions at all four dates, although the proportion declined steadily during the first three dates for the Youth Authority population, while fluctuating during the last three dates for the camps populations. The significance shown for the third date would appear to be a consequence of this fluctuation rather than an indication of any consistent trend.

Type of Offense. The most recent commitment offenses for wards committed to the Youth Authority have been categorized into ten groupings according to criteria implied by the legal definition of the offense.[7]

Within the camps populations Offense Category III (major offense, no intentional jeopardy, for gain) is predominant. Related categories VII and VIII (minor offense, no intentional jeopardy) are the next most numerous. For purposes of analysis, therefore, all offenses have been placed under one of the three groupings: III, VII-VIII, and "Other". A

[7]For a summary and explanation of the Type of Offense Categories, see Appendix B.

comparison of the proportions of each of these groupings in the Youth Authority populations and in the camps populations is shown in Table 4.

Type of offense is one of the major criteria for selection of wards for camp assignment. As noted previously, wards with assaultive, sex offense or narcotics records are seldom eligible for camp. This selectivity is reflected in the disproportional distribution of offense groupings between the camps populations and the Youth Authority populations. Thus, significant under-proportions of the "Other" grouping (including sex offenses, narcotics violations, homicide, assault and robbery) are found at camps, leaving a proportional vacuum to be filled by category III wards, who are over-represented in camps as a result. It is somewhat more difficult to find an explanation for the consistent, but seldom significant, under-representation of category VII-VIII wards in camps. It would be thought that a larger number of these wards would be eligible for camp assignment, perhaps even more so than category III wards. Possible explanations might be that VII-VIII wards are more often given quick releases, directly from the reception center, or that they are more often sent to other facilities for specialized treatment or schooling.

Summary Profile. The comparisons made above have provided a crude profile of the total camp populations based upon the major background characteristics used. The significant differences between the two sets of populations and the major characteristics of the camps population may be summarized thus:

- The camps populations tend to be much less broadly distributed in age range, centering on the 18 - 19 year age levels, while the comparable Youth Authority populations show considerably greater proportions of wards in the 17-and-under category.

- The camps populations contain roughly equal proportions of Juvenile and Criminal court commitments, while other facilities to which Youth Authority wards are assigned tend to be predominantly either Juvenile or Criminal court commitments.

- The camps populations contain between 44 and 48 percent Caucasians, with the remainder about equally composed of Negroes and Mexican-Americans/Others. There are significantly greater proportions of non-Caucasians among the camps populations than would be expected by chance.

- From 50 to 60 percent of the camps populations are committed from Southern California counties, about 20 percent from Central Valley counties and the balance from Bay Area/Other counties. Significantly larger proportions of Central Valley county commitments are found among the camps populations than would be expected by chance.

- About 60 percent of the camps populations are First Admissions, which is not significantly different from the expected proportions.

- Between 65 and 70 percent of the camps population are committed for category III offenses (burglary, auto theft and other thefts). This is significantly greater than would be expected from the proportions within this category among the general Youth Authority populations.

The Distribution of Ward Characteristics Among Camps

If there existed no selective assignment of wards to specific camps, it would be expected that the distribution of characteristics within each of the camps would roughly reflect the characteristics profile for the total camps populations given in the previous section, i.e., no consistent significant differences between the total camps population and

any particular camp population would be expected in relation to the six sets of ward characteristics being examined. Neither would any consistent significant differences be expected between any two pairs of camps.

In Table 7, proportions of wards in the yearly release cohorts for each camp for 1962 and 1963, showing various characteristics, are compared with the proportions of wards in the total camps release cohorts for those years. A number of consistent and significant differences between the proportions of ward characteristics for any particular camp and the total camps cohorts may be seen, as well as variations between various pairs of camps. There is no single camp which completely reflects the characteristics of the total camps population, although no significant differences were found between any single camp and the total camps population in either year for two of the six sets of characteristics: Admission Status and Type of Offense.

A characteristics profile of each camp, and the ways in which the individual camps differ from the total camps population and from each other in terms of ward characteristics may be summarized thus:

Ben Lomond - varies the least of all camps from the total camps proportions, except in terms of Region of Commitment -- there are considerably more wards from Bay Area/Other counties than would be expected, and smaller proportions of wards from Southern California and Central Valley counties than in any other camp.

Mt. Bullion - varies the most of all camps from the total camps proportions. Its population is composed predominantly of younger wards, Juvenile court commitments, and of wards from Southern California.

Table 7

Characteristics of Wards Released from Youth Authority Camps, During 1962 and 1963
As Percentage of Total Camp Population

Characteristics	Total Camps	Ben Lomond	Mount Bullion	Pine Grove	Wash. Ridge	Total Camps	Ben Lomond	Mount Bullion	Pine Grove	Wash. Ridge
Totals	(872) 100.0	(194) 100.0	(269) 100.0	(195) 100.0	(214) 100.0	(956) 100.0	(210) 100.0	(281) 100.0	(221) 100.0	(244) 100.0
Age at Release										
17 and under	22.4	19.6	33.1	19.5	14.0*[a]	26.7	22.9	37.4**	23.1	20.9
18-19	53.4	55.1	49.1	56.9	53.8	49.8	53.3	46.6	51.2	49.2
20 and over	24.2	25.3	17.8*	23.6	32.2*	23.5	23.8	16.0**	25.7	29.9*
Court of Commitment										
Juvenile	51.0	51.5	70.6***	41.0*	35.0**	50.8	52.4	66.9***	42.1*	38.9**
Criminal	49.0	48.5	29.4***	59.0*	65.0**	49.2	47.6	33.1***	57.9*	61.1**
Ethnic Background										
Caucasian	47.4	44.9	42.7	47.2	55.6	49.2	44.3	40.6	51.6	61.1*
Negro	28.3	31.4	29.4	28.7	23.8	27.3	33.3	26.7	28.0	22.1
Mexican-American	24.3	23.7	27.9	24.1	20.6	23.5	22.4	32.7**	20.4	16.8
Region of Commitment										
Southern California	56.5	35.6***	78.8***	47.2	56.1	48.6	32.4***	72.6***	42.1	40.6
Central Valley	17.7	6.7***	14.9	28.2**	21.5	21.7	7.1***	18.9	33.0**	27.4
Bay Area and Other	25.8	57.7***	6.3***	24.6	22.4	29.7	60.5***	8.5***	24.9	32.0
Admission Status										
First Admission	63.2	59.8	68.8	59.5	63.6	63.7	61.9	63.3	61.5	67.6
Readmission	36.8	40.2	31.2	40.5	36.4	36.3	38.1	36.7	38.5	32.4
Type of Offense										
Category III	61.5	61.3	58.4	64.6	62.6	62.0	58.6	59.8	63.3	66.4
Categories VII - VIII	21.5	14.9*	27.5*	22.6	19.2	23.4	21.9	26.3	22.2	22.5
Other Categories	17.0	23.7*	14.1	12.8	18.2	14.6	19.5	13.9	14.5	11.1

[a] Asterisks indicate the significance of the difference between the indicated camp percentage and the percentages for all other categories and for all other camps: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$ (chi-square)

Pine Grove - contains a larger proportion of Criminal court commitments and of Central Valley wards than the total camps population, but is otherwise fairly reflective of the distribution of characteristics in the total camps population.

Washington Ridge - varies significantly from the total camps porportions only on Court of Commitment, having a considerably larger proportion of Criminal court commitments than any other camp. There is a consistent tendency, however, for Washington Ridge to show smaller proportions of young wards, and larger proportions of Caucasian wards than other camps.

The Institutional Origins of Camps Wards

The differential patterns of characteristics distributions found among the various camps are most probably the result of selective factors operative in the assignment of wards to the different camps at intake. This need not imply the existence of a policy of selective assignment, but more likely is a reflection of administrative and program efficiency and convenience. A possible explanation of the selective differences observed is suggested by Table 8, where the institutional origins of wards prior to their assignment to camp are analyzed.

It seems clear that a sort of primary-source relationship exists between certain of the originating institutions and certain camps. The relationships are consistent for both years. The Mt. Bullion populations, for instance, contain a large proportion of wards from the Southern Reception Center and Clinic. In fact, wards from SRCC are seldom sent to any other camp. Similarly, wards from Youth Authority institutions (other than reception centers) are sent predominantly to Pine Grove, where they

Table 8

Institutional Origin of Youth Authority Release Cohorts
Prior to Their Admission to Camp, 1962-63
(In Percent)

Institution of Origin	1962					1963				
	Total Camps	BL	MB	PG	WR	Total Camps	BL	MB	PG	WR
Total	(872) 100.0	(194) 100.0	(269) 100.0	(195) 100.0	(214) 100.0	(956) 100.0	(210) 100.0	(281) 100.0	(221) 100.0	(244) 100.0
NRCC	22.4	37.6	17.1	8.7	27.6	30.0	44.3	17.8	22.2	38.9
SRCC	16.5	1.0	47.2	7.7	0.0	14.1	0.0	44.1	5.0	0.0
CDC-RGC	34.5	41.7	20.8	29.7	49.5	40.9	42.4	29.9	43.4	50.0
YA Instit.	13.2	8.8	3.7	39.5	5.1	9.1	6.2	6.2	22.2	2.9
CDC Instit.	12.2	9.8	9.3	14.4	15.9	4.2	5.2	.7	1.8	5.3
Other Instit.	1.2	1.0	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.7	1.9	1.1	.9	2.9

form a major element in the population. All four camps receive heavily from the Department of Corrections Reception and Guidance Centers, but none so heavily as Washington Ridge. Ben Lomond receives wards predominantly from CDC-RGC and from NRCC, with relatively few from any other facilities. It would seem likely that this relationship plays a strong role in influencing the characteristics differences between camps. Thus, the types of wards assigned to Washington Ridge would seem to be largely determined by the types of wards received at NRCC and at the CDC-RGC who are eligible for the general camp program. To the extent that this is true, then the initial assignment of a ward to a particular reception center or institution even prior to his consideration for the camp program

is, itself, an important element in the differential selectivity process in camp assignment. This element should be kept in mind and will be examined further in later phases of the study.

THE WEEDING-OUT PROCESS:
TRANSFERS AND ESCAPES

A little more than 20 percent of the total of wards admitted to the various Youth Conservation camps are <u>not</u> directly released to parole from the camps. These are the disciplinary problems, the escapees, the maladjusted, transfers for health purposes, wards returned to court, etc. The effect of this weeding-out process is shown in Table 9, where the proportions of parolees, transfers, escapees and other types of releasees among the total camps and individual camps release cohorts are examined:

Table 9

Youth Conservation Camp Release Cohorts, by Type of Release
(In Percent)

Year	Type of Release	Total Camps	Ben Lomond	Mt. Bullion	Pine Grove	Wash. Ridge
1962						
	Total	(872) 100.0	(194) 100.0	(269) 100.0	(195) 100.0	(214) 100.0
	Parole	77.6	68.6	83.6	72.8	82.7
	Transfer	15.0	23.7	13.0	15.4	9.3
	Escape	6.7	5.7	3.4	11.8	7.0
	Other	.7	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
1963						
	Total	(956) 100.0	(210) 100.0	(281) 100.0	(221) 100.0	(244) 100.0
	Parole	78.5	70.9	85.0	76.5	79.1
	Transfer	15.5	27.1	10.3	15.4	11.5
	Escape	5.0	.5	3.2	8.1	8.2
	Other	1.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.2

It is immediately apparent that there exist rather wide variations between camps in the proportions of wards involved in the weeding-out process. For both years, Ben Lomond released the largest proportion of non-parole releasees, while Mt. Bullion released the smallest proportions. A difference of about 15 percentage points divides the two camps in each year. In both years the proportions of non-parole releasees for Pine Grove and for Washington Ridge fell between those for the other camps, but in 1962 the two camps were divided by 9.9 percentage points, with Pine Grove closer to the proportion for Ben Lomond, and Washington Ridge close to Mt. Bullion. In 1963, however, both Pine Grove and Washington Ridge occupied median positions in relation to the other two camps, with only a 2.6 percentage point difference dividing them.

The second point of interest in Table 9 concerns the relationship between Transfers and Escapes. That is, a sort of inverse ratio appears whereby the camps with higher transfer rates tend to have lower escape rates, and vice versa. The first part of the relationship appears logical -- potential escapees are probably transferred before they have an opportunity to escape, but the obverse does not necessarily hold true. It is possible that the higher escape rates are to some extent reflections of differences in camp control and camp policy. Thus, higher escape rates might be influenced by 1) greater opportunity for escape, or 2) greater dissatisfaction with the camp experience. Both of these hypotheses will be examined further in Phase II of the study.

In the first of the three hypotheses advanced previously (p. 2) in explanation of the better parole performance of camp wards generally in comparison with parolees from other institutions, it was noted that the weeding-out process should tend to eliminate poorer parole-risk material from the camps. If this partial hypothesis is valid, and assuming that

the definition of poor parole-risk material is related to one or more of the characteristics discussed in previous sections, then it might reasonably be expected that some significant differences in those characteristics would differentiate the weeded-out wards from those released to parole. A test for such differences is made in Table 10:

Table 10

Comparison of Characteristics of Parole Releasees and of Non-Parole Releasees from Youth Conservation Camps, 1962 and 1963 Cohorts, by Percentage of Type of Release

Characteristics	1962 Release Cohort			1963 Release Cohort		
	Total	Parole Releasees	Non-Parole Releasees	Total	Parole Releasees	Non-Parole Releasees
Cohort Totals	(872) 100.0	(677) 100.0	(195) 100.0	(956) 100.0	(750) 100.0	(206) 100.0
Age at Release						
17 and under	22.2	22.3	22.1	26.7	23.5	38.3**a
18-19	53.4	52.6	56.4	49.8	51.6	43.2
20 and over	24.4	25.1	21.5	23.5	24.9	18.5
Ethnic Background						
Caucasian	47.4	43.7	60.0**	49.2	47.6	54.9
Negro	28.3	29.5	24.1	27.3	27.7	25.7
Mex.-American	24.3	26.8	15.9*	23.5	24.7	19.4
Region of Comm.						
Southern Calif.	56.5	59.2	47.2	48.6	49.2	46.2
Central Valley	17.7	18.3	15.4	21.7	22.5	18.9
Bay Area/Other	25.8	22.5	37.4**	29.7	28.3	34.9
Admission Status						
First Admission	63.2	65.0	58.5	63.7	67.9	49.0***
Readmission	36.8	35.0	41.5	36.3	32.1	51.0***

[a]No significant differences were found for Court of Commitment or for Type of Offense. Asterisks indicate significant differences: between Parole and Non-Parole Releasees for each characteristic categories:
* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. (chi-square)

None of the differences observed appear consistently significant over both years. However, wards 20-years-of-age-and-over appear among the non-parole releasees less often in both years, while Caucasian wards and Bay Area/Other commitments are more likely to appear among the non-parole releasees.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CAMPS PAROLEES

A major effect of the weeding-out process is simply the reduction of the number of wards released to parole from the camps. Phase V of this study will be primarily concerned with relating the performance upon parole of 1963 camp parolees to various other factors encountered in the preceding phases of the study. Therefore, a listing of characteristics proportions for parolees from each camp, comparable to that provided in Table 7 for the entire camps release cohorts, is shown in Table 11 (see next page).

The proportions found in Table 7 are closely reflected in Table 11. The greatest proportional difference between the two tables is found in relation to Admission Status at Ben Lomond in 1963, where the elimination of non-parole releasees resulted in a proportional increase of 7.9 percentage points for First Admissions and a corresponding decrease for Readmissions.

Base Expectancy Categories for Camp Parolees

Base Expectancy scores were computed for parole releasees from each of the four camps for 1962 and 1963. The proportions of "Good", "Average"

Table 11

Characteristics of Wards Released to Parole from Youth Authority Conservation Camps, by Percent of Camps Release Cohorts for 1962 and 1963[a]

Characteristics	1962 Parole Release Cohort					1963 Parole Release Cohort				
	All Camps	Ben Lomond	Mt. Bullion	Pine Grove	Wash. Ridge	All Camps	Ben Lomond	Mt. Bullion	Pine Grove	Wash. Ridge
Totals	(640) 100.0	(129) 100.0	(216) 100.0	(133) 100.0	(162) 100.0	(715) 100.0	(142) 100.0	(233) 100.0	(157) 100.0	(183) 100.0
Age at Release										
17 and under	23.3	14.8	34.6	22.4	15.8	24.2	16.2	34.8	19.1	21.2
18-19	52.8	57.1	47.4	56.7	53.3	51.6	59.2	50.2	51.0	48.4
20 and over	23.9	28.1	18.0	20.9	30.9	24.2	24.6	15.0	29.9	30.4
Court of Commitment										
Juvenile	54.0	51.6	72.8	46.3	37.6	51.1	51.4	67.4	38.8	40.8
Criminal	46.0	48.4	27.2	53.7	62.4	48.9	48.6	32.6	61.2	59.2
Ethnic Background										
Caucasian	41.3	39.1	37.8	37.3	50.9	46.5	45.8	36.5	49.8	57.1
Negro	30.7	35.9	30.0	36.6	23.0	28.4	35.9	28.3	27.3	23.4
Mexican-Amer./Other	28.0	25.0	32.2	26.1	26.1	25.1	18.3	35.2	22.9	19.6
Region of Commitment										
Southern Calif.	58.4	35.2	80.2	46.3	57.6	48.8	33.8	71.3	41.4	38.0
Central Valley	18.6	5.5	14.7	31.3	23.6	23.0	5.6	19.7	34.4	31.0
Bay Area - Other	23.0	59.3	5.1	22.4	18.8	28.2	60.6	9.0	24.2	31.0
Admission Status										
First Admission	63.5	61.7	70.0	56.7	61.8	66.6	69.0	63.5	66.9	68.5
Readmission	36.5	38.3	30.0	43.3	38.2	33.4	31.0	36.5	33.1	31.5
Type of Offense										
Category III	60.3	64.8	55.7	63.5	60.0	60.6	57.8	58.8	59.2	66.3
Categs. VII - VIII	22.5	13.3	28.6	23.1	21.2	23.6	21.8	26.6	23.6	21.2
Other Categories	17.2	21.9	15.7	13.4	18.8	15.8	20.4	14.6	17.2	12.5

[a]Percentages are based only upon Releasees to Parole in California. 33 of the parolees in 1962 and 34 of the Parolees in 1963 included in the Parole Totals shown in Table 10 were released to Out-of-State Parole Supervision. An additional four wards in 1962 and one ward in 1963 were paroled twice from Institutions during those respective years and are omitted from some of the subsequent tables.

and "Poor" risk wards in each camp cohort for the two years is shown in Table 12. There were no significant differences in risk category levels were found between any particular camp and the total camps cohorts for either year.

Table 12

Percentages of Parole Releasees in Three Base Expectancy Categories, by Camp for 1962 and 1963

Camps	1962				1963			
	Total[a] (100.0)	Good Risk	Aver. Risk	Poor Risk	Total[a] (100.0)	Good Risk	Aver. Risk	Poor Risk
Total	640	48.4	33.0	18.6	715	54.1	29.2	16.7
Ben Lomond	129	49.6	32.5	17.8	142	58.5	27.5	14.0
Mt. Bullion	216	45.4	35.6	19.0	233	48.5	30.0	21.5
Pine Grove	133	45.9	28.5	25.6	157	56.7	28.0	15.3
Washington Ridge	162	53.4	33.7	12.9	183	55.7	30.6	13.7

[a]Base expectancy scores were computed for only 640 of the 677 wards paroled from camps in 1962, and only 715 of the 750 wards paroled in 1963. The difference is composed primarily of wards who were paroled out-of-state or were paroled twice during the year from different institutions. Although the numbers are too small for adequate testing, there do not appear to be any particular common characteristics among the eliminated wards which would differentiate them from the remaining camp parolees.

PAROLE PERFORMANCE OF THE 1962 PAROLE COHORT

By April 1, 1964, fifteen months had passed since the last of the 1962 camp parolees had been released from camp. In Table 13, the parole violation rates of these 1962 parolees within fifteen months since release is shown. Violators are defined as those wards who were revoked, given violational discharges, or under suspension of parole which led to either a revoke or violational discharge, prior to the end of the fifteenth month since their release.

There is no significant difference between the proportions for any particular camp in relation to the overall proportions for total camps, nor between any pairs of camps.

Table 13

Parole Performance of 1962 Camp Parole Releasees, by Percentage of Violators and Non-Violators of Parole following 15 Month From Date of Release

Camp	Total[a] (100.0)	Violators	Non-Violators
Total	640	31.0	69.0
Ben Lomond	129	24.8	75.2
Mt. Bullion	216	34.3	65.7
Pine Grove	133	33.8	66.2
Washington Ridge	162	29.6	70.4

[a]Parole performance data was available upon only 540 of the 677 parolees released from camps in 1962. (see footnote to Table 11.)

The data in Table 13 indicates only the gross violation rates per camp, it does not consider the question of whether parolees from one camp tended to violate faster, or to have less time from release to violation, than parolees from another camp. If a parolee does not become a violator within 15 months from the date of his release, he will have spent 455 $\pm$ 2 days on "good" parole status. If no parolees from a particular camp had become violators, then they collectively would have a mean of 455 "good" days on parole. Any increase in the number of violators from that camp would result in a smaller number of "good" days for the camp as a whole. If most of the violations occurred within the first sixty days from release,

then the mean number of good days for the camp as a whole would be smaller than if the same number of violations had occurred after 120 days from release. Between two or more camps, then, the actual mean "good" days as a proportion of 455, or the mean total possible "good" days, serves as a good comparative index of the parole performance of parolees from each camp. Data relevant to this comparison for the 1962 camp parolees is given in Table 14:

Table 14

Parole Performance of 1962 Camp Parole Releasees, by Percentage of "Good" Time on Parole

Camp	Total Parolees	Actual Mean "Good" Days	Total Possible "Good" Days	Percent of Possible "Good" Days
Total	640	386.8	291,200	84.6
Ben Lomond	129	402.6	58,695	87.8
Mt. Bullion	216	368.8	99,480	80.6
Pine Grove	133	379.9	60,515	82.7
Washington Ridge	162	395.9	73,710	84.5

There were no significant differences in proportions. On the basis of the analysis of parole performance data for the 1962 parole releasees, therefore, there appears no reason to believe that the overall parole performance of parolees from any one camp is significantly better than from any other camp. It remains to be seen whether this is confirmed for the 1963 parole release cohort.

The central "self-milieu" hypothesis of this study, however, is not directly concerned with <u>overall</u> comparisons of the different camps in terms of the parole behavior of their parolees, but rather with the parole

behavior of various categories of parolees exposed to different camp milieux. Therefore, the parole performance of 1962 parolees within each ward characteristic category was examined in relation to camp of origin. The percentage of violators among each category group within each camp is shown in Table 15. (Next page)

It is apparent from Table 15 that there exist rather wide variations within the 1962 parolee cohort on the proportions of parole violators among parolees from different camps in relation to specific characteristics categories. The differences in extreme proportions for each category range from 8.3 percentage points to 30.4 percentage points.

This range of violation rates suggested that possibly there existed an interaction effect between the parole performance of wards defined by some common characteristic, such as a specific age category, race, or offense category, when compared with all other wards, in terms of the camps from which they were released. An analysis of variance test (using arc-sine transformations) was made for each characteristics category, comparing the violation rates of wards within that category with the rates for wards <u>not</u> in that category, within each of the four camps (i.e., the rates for Caucasians within each camp were compared with the rates for all non-Caucasians within each camp, etc., for each separate characteristics category.) Of the 13 tests thus performed, three exhibited significant interactions over all four camps at the less than .05 level: 20-years-of-age-and-over vs. all other age groups; Negro vs. all other racial groups, and Bay Area/Other commitments vs. commitments from all other regions.

Table 15

Ward Characteristics and Parole Performance
for 1962 Camp Parolees, by Camp
(Percentages of Violators within each camp and category)[a]

Characteristics	Overall	Ben Lomond	Mt. Bullion	Pine Grove	Wash. Ridge	Signif. of Inter-action[b]
Total	30.8	23.8	34.3	33.6	29.5	
Age at Release:						
17 and under	37.1	25.0	41.3	36.7	34.6	
18 - 19	35.1	23.3	39.8	35.5	31.8	$p < .005$
20 and over	19.7	25.0	5.1	25.0	23.5	
Court of Commitment						
Juvenile	36.4	28.4	41.1	35.5	33.9	n.s.
Criminal	24.1	19.0	15.2	31.9	26.9	
Ethnic Background						
Caucasian	27.0	15.7	28.0	38.0	26.2	
Negro	35.7	37.0	44.6	26.5	30.8	$p < .05$
Mex.Amer./Other	30.9	18.2	31.4	37.1	34.9	
Region of Commitment						
Southern Calif.	32.9	22.2	34.5	35.5	33.3	
Central Valley	30.8	28.6	37.5	23.8	33.3	$p < .05$
Bay Area/Other	25.3	24.4	18.2	43.3	12.9	
Admission Status						
First Admission	26.3	18.5	31.6	23.7	26.5	n.s.
Readmission	38.6	32.6	40.0	46.5	34.4	
Type of Offense						
Category III	30.5	24.7	30.6	36.5	30.3	
Categories VII-VIII	32.9	17.6	41.9	25.8	30.6	n.s.
Other Categories[c]	28.8	25.0	32.3	33.3	25.8	

[a]Percentages are based upon the same 1962 parolees used in Tables 11, 12, and 13, plus five wards paroled twice during the year from different institutions, one of which was a camp.

[b]Significance of Interaction based on Analysis of Variance (Arc-sine transformation).

[c]No test was made of this category due to the relatively small frequencies involved.

Parole Performance and Characteristics Interactions by Specific Camps

In an effort to further define the nature of the interaction effect in each of the above cases where a significant interaction was encountered, a test was made, using the same method, but comparing each individual camp against the other three camps combined, with the following results:

20-years-of-age and over vs. all other age groups - the violation rates of wards 20-and-over compared to those 19- and-under for each camp individually vs. the three other camps combined are shown in Table 16:

Table 16

Parole Violation Rates of Wards Dichotomized by Age, for Each Camp vs. Other Camps, 1962 Parole Cohort

Age Category	Total Camps	Ben Lomond	Other	Mount Bullion	Other	Pine Grove	Other	Wash. Ridge	Other
Total	30.8	23.8	32.5	34.1	29.0	33.6	30.0	29.5	31.1
19 & under	34.3	23.4	36.8	40.4	30.7	35.8	33.8	32.2	34.8
20 & over	19.5	25.0	17.8	5.1	24.3	25.0	18.2	23.5	17.5
χ^2 (Interaction)		4.48		14.05		.27		1.02	
Significance (1 d.f.)		p = .05		.001		n.s.		n.s.	

It appears from Table 16 that the major interaction lies in the contrast between the violation rates for the two age groupings at Mt. Bullion camp when compared with the combined violation rates of wards from the other camps. Inspection indicates that even the significance of the interaction when Ben Lomond is compared to other camps, stems primarily from differences between the two age groupings among "Other" camps because of the inclusion of Mt. Bullion. It seems clear, then, that something "different"

is occurring in relation to parolees of different ages from Mt. Bullion, which is not occurring among parolees from any of the other camps.

Negroes vs. all other racial groupings - the violation rates of Negro parolees are compared to those of non-Negro parolees for each camp individually vs. the three other camps combined in Table 17:

Table 17

Parole Violation Rates of Wards by Racial Grouping for Each Camp vs. Other Camps, 1962 Parole Cohort

Racial Grouping	Total Camps	Ben Lomond	Other	Mount Bullion	Other	Pine Grove	Other	Wash. Ridge	Other
Total	30.8	23.8	32.5	34.1	29.0	33.6	30.0	29.5	31.1
Negro	35.7	37.0	35.3	44.6	31.3	26.5	38.7	30.8	36.9
Non-Negro	28.6	16.7	31.3	29.6	28.0	37.6	26.4	29.1	28.3
χ^2 (Interaction)		3.39		1.75		6.07		.50	
Significance (1 d.f.)		p = .10		n.s.		.02		n.s.	

Again, the major interaction centers upon the comparison of differential parole violation rates between parolees in each of the two categories at one camp, this time Pine Grove, when compared with parolees from the other camps combined. It is apparent that Negro parolees from Pine Grove maintained a better performance record than did Negroes from any other camps, or than non-Negroes from the same camp. To a lesser extent, the reverse was true for Ben Lomond parolees.

Bay Area/Other commitments vs. all other commitments - the violation rates upon parole of Bay Area/Other commitments are compared to those of

commitments from other counties for each camp individually vs. the three other camps combined in Table 18:

Table 18

Parole Violation Rates of Wards by Region of Commitment, for Each Camp vs. Other Camps, 1962 Parole Cohort

Region of Commitment	Total Camps	Ben Lomond	Other	Mount Bullion	Other	Pine Grove	Other	Wash. Ridge	Other
Total	30.8	23.8	32.5	34.1	29.0	33.6	30.0	29.5	31.1
Bay Area/ Other	25.3	24.4	26.4	18.2	25.9	43.3	20.8	12.9	28.6
Other Regions	32.4	23.1	33.5	34.9	30.6	30.8	32.8	33.3	32.0
χ^2 (Interaction) Significance (1 d.f.)		.71 p = n. s.		1.29 n.s.		5.14 .025		3.49 .10	

The major interaction effect is found in the comparison of parole violation rates for wards again from Pine Grove vs. the three other camps combined, but this time it appears due to the poorer performance upon parole of Bay Area/ Other parolees from Pine Grove in comparison both with parolees from the same regional category at other camps and with parolees from other regions at the same camp. This time the minor interaction was found relative to Washington Ridge parolees from Bay Area/Other counties, who appear to do much better than other parolees.

It should be emphasized that due to the absence of a validation sample the relationships indicated can only be accepted as descriptive of the performance of parolees from the 1962 cohort. Thus, findings concerning

only this cohort are subject to possible change in succeeding cohorts due to changes in characteristics relationships, changes in the composition of camps populations, etc. Too, the question of dependence-independence of the characteristics arises -- i.e., at Pine Grove if none of the better performing Negroes are from the Bay Area/Other counties, this alone might do much to explain the relatively poorer performance at that camp of wards from those counties. These questions will be examined more closely in Phase V of this study. Therefore, only suggestive implication, rather than true inferences, can be interpreted from the data at this time. If the relationships shown, however, are supported by the parole performance of the 1963 cohort, then the generalized hypothesis may be considered: that any rehabilitative effect of the camp experience is not simply generalized overall, but is differentially affective (either positively or negatively) in relation to particular types of wards exposed to different camp milieux.

CONCLUSIONS

In relation to the "self-milieu" hypothesis stated in the introduction (supra, p. 4) the following statements concerning the population characteristics analyses contained in Phase I appear relevant:

1. The wards assigned to Youth Conservation camps are a significantly different population than Youth Authority wards sixteen-years-of-age and over in other institutions in terms of a number of characteristics which are independently significantly related to parole performance.
2. Wards assigned to each of the four individual camps show a number of consistent and significant characteristics differences in comparison with the proportions of those characteristics in the total camps population.
3. There is no consistent significant difference in overall parole performance proportions for any individual camp in relation to the overall proportions for the total camps population, or between any pairs of camps.
4. The data for the 1962 parolees suggest that there <u>are</u> differences in the parole performance of certain categories of wards when released from different camps. Thus, 20-years-of-age-and-over wards from Mt. Bullion, and Negroes from Pine Grove maintained lower parole violation rates than did their counterparts in other camps, or than did other wards in the same camps; while Bay Area/Other commitments at Pine Grove indicated a much higher violation rate than did wards in other camps or wards from other counties at the same camp.

The above suggest the differentially affective influence of camp milieu factors on the parole performance of releasees. Whether this influence is general or relative will be examined in subsequent phases of the study.

APPENDIX A

The Concept of the "Self" and Its Relationship to Treatment

The concept of "Self" is central to the present study in providing an analytic framework for studying the dynamic processes of ward "change" in an institutional setting.

In psychological literature the Self is seen as an independently definable component of the individual's psychological structure, functionally related, but distinct from such other components as the Ego, Personality, "I", etc. The Self is essentially that part of the psychological structure which interacts with the world outside the individual. It is developed through the individual's experience with other persons and objects with which it comes into contact. Particularly through interpersonal contact with other individuals, either singly or in groups, the Self learns patterns of behavior and response appropriate to a wide variety of relationships. Through this process the Self also tends to internalize those norms, values, attitudes and beliefs indigenous to the other groups and individuals with whom it interacts and with whom it identifies. These internalized patterns of behavior, value, attitude and belief then serve as guides to future modes of appropriate response and appearance in similar social and interpersonal contexts.

The Self not only perceives and interacts with others within an environment, but it also has the ability to perceive and react to itself--to experience and make judgements concerning itself and its own appearance. It is around this ability that its four primary functions on behalf of the individual are organized. These are: 1) the organization of perceptions, 2) the definition of value, 3) the formation of attitudes, and 4) the regulation of behavior.

The Self is the principle receiver and organizer of stimuli from the perceptual field and as such its principle function is to relate immediate perceptive experience to relevant items in its storehouse of prior experiences and to organize the related sets of experience in meaningful form in order to determine the responses appropriate to the immediate situational field.

As the receiver, organizer and interpreter of perceptual stimuli, the Self also comes to function as the evaluator of experience as well as of itself-within-experience. Its perceptual interpretations of external objects and persons will be couched in value terms of good, bad, painful, enjoyable, desirable, repulsive, etc., and as it perceives itself as an object it will apply similar evaluations to itself. Evaluations of external objects and persons inevitably become relative to the individual's own self-evaluation.

As such evaluations of itself and others are formulated, the third function of the Self is brought into play: the formation of attitudes toward such other objects and persons within its experiential field. These attitudes are formulated as predispositions for action toward the objects concerned.

Finally, stemming directly from the confrontation and conflict of divergent attitudes, values, and mores, the Self must function as a regulator of behavior. It receives cues from "significant others" within the social context as to appropriate modes of behavior. Essentially, the Self tends toward behavior that satisfies and conserves its own maximal evaluations of itself -- its self-esteem, self-regard, self-respect, etc.

In doing this task, it also regulates the other functions of the Self by censoring perception and rejecting the acknowledgement of threatening experience.

The relevance of this concept of the Self to the institutional treatment process lies both in the limitations for purposive treatment which it establishes, as well as in the rehabilitative strategies which it suggests. Thus, if this study is correct in its assumption that the "end goal of delinquency treatment... is positive change in the character, overt behavior, attitudes, predispositions and/or emotional outlook of the person undergoing treatment..." (supra, p. 3) then it would seem to follow that any treatment, if it is to become effective, must impinge upon that part of the human psychological structure which governs the conscious behavioral, attitudinal and emotional organization of the individual -- the Self.

Limitations to treatment lie in the fact that it is the Self which ultimately will determine the rate, mode and degree of change which will be made, in consideration of its interpretation of the meaning and relevance to itself of new experiences, new group affiliations, new evaluative comparisons and new forms of interpersonal interaction, all in relation to its prior experiences, prior evaluations, etc. This control of the field of interaction and change by the Self must to a considerable degree predetermine the strategies which are available to those attempting to effect the change. Basically, it would seem that such strategies of change must be associated with exposure of the self to new forms of experience which will require of it reformulation of its own self-view and self-evaluation.

The strong emotional need of the individual for positive self-evaluation would seem to be the primary key to the process of guided or encouraged self-change. This view suggests that the direction and degree of positive change will be maximal where the treatment is most closely associated with the self-evaluative needs of the individual, and minimal were it is least associated with those needs. The pattern of experiences provided by the treatment process may be seen as in a contest with other divergent experiential patterns in an effort to best satisfy these self-evaluative needs. If the treatment process offers no more potentially valued alternatives to the satisfactions derived by the Self from delinquent activities, then the effectiveness of the treatment experience must be questioned.

The task of the research worker becomes that of attempting to define modes of treatment experience which tend to be positively evaluated by various categories of "Selfs" -- which are seen as endowing those "Selfs" with esteem or prestige, and, conversely, of attempting to determine methods of identifying and devaluating those modes which are antagonistic to the purposes of the treatment. For such answers the researcher must turn again to the central element in the process -- the Self--for clues to the ways in which it seeks to fulfill its self-evaluational needs. These are generally to be found in relation to the individual's overt behavior patterns, his responses to others, and his attitudes toward others within his immediate situational field. Thus, the observable patterns of association and preference, role and status behavior in interpersonal and group situations, both familiar and unfamiliar, and overt responses to new and changing patterns of experience, serve as basic

indicators of the nature of the affective self-processes through which change and re-orientation of the Self must occur.

To sum up, effective treatment processes must develop within the framework of the interaction of the individual Self with elements in the experiential field associated with the treatment (in this study, termed the "milieu"). Clues to the affective elements of the treatment experience are to be found in the interaction process and are indicated by the overt patterns of association and response of the Self to persons, and objects, within the experiential field, including itself. If treatment effectiveness is to be enhanced it must come about through a clearer understanding of the nature of the actors in the field -- the self and the other significant objects in the milieu -- and the nature of the interactions in which they are involved. Within the limitations of specific time and place, that is what the present study attempts to explore.

APPENDIX B

Explanation of the Type of Offense Categories

The following system of categorization of offenses was developed as a means of grouping the extensive list of offense codes used in the ward record cards into some manageable, yet meaningful, form for comparative analysis. Ten categories of offenses are specified. The first eight are derived from combinations of three dichotomized variables which are nearly always stated or implied by the legal definitions of the various offenses: 1) a severity of offense dichotomy (Major - Minor) which is based upon the general legal interpretation of an offense as a felony or as a misdemeanor; 2) the implied presence or absence of actual or threatened intent to commit bodily injury in the general definition of the offense, (jeopardy-no jeopardy) and 3) whether the offense is usually involved with, or for, material or monetary gain, or not. The final two special categories include 1) all non-rape sex offenses and 2) all narcotic offenses.

The categories, their descriptions, and the types of offenses included within each, are shown below:

Category		
I	Major offense, jeopardy, for gain	Robbery, kidnapping
II	Major offense, jeopardy, not necessarily for gain	Murder, attempted murder, assault, violent rape, attempt to rape
III	Major offense, no intentional jeopardy, for gain	Burglary, grand theft, GTA

Category		
VI	Minor Offense, jeopardy, not necessarily for gain	Simple assault and battery, cruelty to and abandonment of children
VII	Minor offense, no intentional jeopardy for gain	Petty theft, embezzlement, forgery, receiving stolen property, gambling
VIII	Minor offense, no intentional jeopardy, not necessarily for gain	W & I code violators, representing self as public officer, possession of deadly weapon, driving, liquor and vagrancy offenses, miscellaneous other offenses
IX	Sex offenses (exluding rape)	
X	Narcotics offenses	

It should be noted that if there is a possibility of confusion as to within which category a particular offense is to be assigned, the emphasis is always upon the positive identification of the offense as "Major", clear "intentional jeopardy", and clearly "for gain". Otherwise the offense is categorized under the appropriate negative designation. Thus, though arson may be for gain and often is, it is not <u>necessarily</u> associated with gain in the manner of robbery or burglary. Similarly, manslaughter and negligent homicide do not necessarily imply a clear <u>intent</u> to kill, and are therefore assigned to a "no intentional jeopardy" category.

In the present study, category III stands alone in the analysis, categories VII and VIII are combined, and categories I, II, IV, VI, IX and X are all included as "Other".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Beverly, Robert F. An Inter-Facility Comparison of Parole Violation Rates. State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Research, Research Report No. 4, March, 1959.

2. Beverly, Robert F. and Guttman, E. S. An Analysis of Parole Performance by Institution of Release (1956 - 1960). State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Research, Research Report No. 31, November, 1962.

3 Beverly, Robert F. An Analysis of Parole Performance by Institution of Release (1959 - 1962). State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Research, Research Report No. 40, February, 1965.

4 Bohnstedt, M. A. and Beverly, Robert F. An Inter-Facility Comparison of Expected and Observed Parole Violation Rates (1957). State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Research, Research Report No. 14, October, 1959.

5 California Division of Forestry. 1962 Conservation Camp Program. State of California, Department of Conservation, April, 1963.

6 California Youth Authority, Division of Research. Annual Statistical Report, 1962.

7 California Youth Authority. Annual Statistical Report, 1963.

8 California Youth Authority, Division of Research. Characteristics of California Youth Authority Wards. June 30, 1962 through December 31, 1963.

9. Stark Heman G. "Work Camps for Youthful Offenders," California Youth Authority Quarterly, 14, 1 (Spring, 1961).

10. Weber, George H. Report, Consultation on Public Youth Work Camps. Cited in Cary, Lee J. "History of the Work Camp as a Method of Treating Delinquents," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXII, 5 (October, 1962).